Summary of Representation.—The present age limit of infant marriage is very low and may be raised from 14 to 16 and from 8 to 10.

Reply of Government.—No change is called for as the people themselves are alive to advantages of a late marriage and perform marriages at a fairly advanced age.

SUBJECT No. 87.

Amendment of the Infant Marriage Regulation.

Mr. H. Narayana Rao, Molakalmuru Taluk.

Summary of Representation.—The Mining Regulation is very drastic. Undesirables are evicted without a regular enquiry and there is no right of appeal. The term 'undesirable' is not also defined.

Reply of Government.—Exceptional cases require exceptional remedies.

SUBJECT No. 88.

Amendment of Section 17 of the Mines Regulation.

Messrs. T. M. Ramachandra Rao and K. Rame Gowda, Bowringpet Taluk, and M. Channabasappa, Bowringpet Municipality.

PROTECTION.—(JUDICIAL.)

(Nos. 89 to 106.)

Summary of Representation.—The privilege of another examination in December and the consequent extension of time for enrolment of second grade pleaders came late. Benefit of compartment system could not be availed of. One more chance of another examination may be given and the time extended till May next. We promise not to press for any more chances.

Reply of Government.—The time will be extended till 1st July 1923.

SUBJECT No. 89.

Allowing Matriculates and School Finals to become Pleaders.

Mr. J. Subba Rao, Chitaldrug District Board.

Summary of Representation.—Some time ago first and second grade pleaders were permitted to practise both in the Munsiffs' Courts and Criminal Courts in any part of the State. Now they are allowed to practise in only one district. This causes hardship to clients who cannot take their own pleaders to other places. The old practice may be restored. This practice obtains in Bombay and does not involve any loss to Government.

Mr. G. Sanjeeviah opposed the proposal on the ground that if, from places where the number of pleaders was small, some of them were taken away to other places, they would not be available for being engaged by other litigants.

The Chief Judge stated that pleaders should select one particular district and practise there; that the proposal meant the doing away with the distinction between advocates and pleaders and that it was not possible to grant the same.

Reply of Government.—The present practice is good for the profession and for the clients.

SUBJECT No. 90.

Permission to pleaders to practice in courts in all districts.

Messrs. B. Kesaviah and Vastare Honnappiah, Chikmagalur Taluk.